

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

. COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
WWW.USPTO.GOV

Paper No.

ST. ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS, LLC 986 BEDFORD STREET STAMFORD CT 06905-5619

MAILED

DEC 062010

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of
Wittorff
:

Application No. 10/585,019

Filed: April 17, 2007 : DECISION ON PETITION

Attorney Docket No. 05198- : UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(B)

P0017A :

Title: COMPRESSED BIODEGRADABLE

CHEWING GUM

This is a decision on the petition filed September 16, 2010, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b), to revive the above-identified application.

The petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) is GRANTED.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to reply within the meaning of 37 C.F.R § 1.113 in a timely manner to the final Office action mailed December 24, 2009, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of three months. An after-final amendment was received on June 14, 2010 along with a three-month extension of time so as to make timely the response, and an advisory action was mailed on July 6, 2010. No additional extensions of time under the provisions of 37 C.F.R § 1.136(a) were available, and no further responses were received. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on June 25, 2010. A notice of abandonment was mailed on August 2, 2010.

A grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

- (1) The reply required to the outstanding Office action or notice, unless previously filed;
- (2) The petition fee as set forth in 37 C.F.R.

 $\S 1.17(m);$

- (3) A statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to this paragraph was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional, and;
- (4) Any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.20(d)) required pursuant to paragraph (d) of this section.

With this petition, Petitioner filed a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) along with the required fee, an amendment, the petition fee, and the proper statement of unintentional delay. The amendment has been accepted as the required reply under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b)(1).

As such, the first three requirements of Rule 1.137(b) have been met. The fourth requirement of Rule 1.137(b) is not applicable, as a terminal disclaimer is not required.

The Technology Center will be notified of this decision. The Technology Center's support staff will notify the Examiner of this decision, so that the submission under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 - the amendment submitted on September 16, 2010 - can be processed in due course.

Petitioner may find it beneficial to view Private PAIR within a fortnight of the present decision to ensure that the revival has been acknowledged by the Technology Center in response to this decision. It is noted that all inquiries with regard to any failure of that change in status should be directed to the Technology Center where that change of status must be effected - the Office of Petitions cannot effectuate a change of status.

Telephone inquiries regarding this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3225. All other inquiries

^{1 &}lt;u>See</u> Rule 1.137(d).

² Petitioner will note that all practice before the Office should be in writing, and the action of the Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.2. As such, Petitioner is reminded that no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for Petitioner's further action(s).

Application No. 10/585,019 Decision on Petition

concerning examination procedures or status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center.

/Paul Shanoski/
Paul Shanoski
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions